

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 10-12, 15-16, 20-22 and 25-27 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 are amended, and claims 3-4, 13-14 and 23-24 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The term "depth cueing area" is supported in the specification, for example, in Fig. 2 and in the corresponding passages of the specification. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 10-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Foley ("Computer Graphics: Principles And Practice") in view of Deering (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011618A1), and further in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,904). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Foley, Deering nor Griffin, individually or in combination, discloses or suggests varying an alpha (α) value of the object on condition that the object is positioned within a depth cueing area, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27.

The Office Action at page 5 asserts that Foley in Fig. 3.1 and at pages 67-68, discloses the use of bounding boxes for the bounding of an object or objects within a given area. Independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 are amended to replace the term "given area" with "depth cueing area" in order to clarify the claim language. As discussed above, the depth cueing area is defined in Fig. 2 in the corresponding passages of the specification.

Foley discloses the use of bounding boxes for identifying overlapped objects. In particular, the Office Action reads the features of claim 3 as clipping an object in a given area. However, clipping is a process being executed whether an object hides within a screen or not, which depends on the object size. Further, the identification of overlapped objects using bounding boxes depends on the object shape. On the other hand, the independent

claims recite depth cueing for an object on condition that the object is positioned within a depth cueing area such that the color of the object being more distant from a viewpoint is made closer to a target color. As the claims recite, the claimed invention pertains to drawing the objects positioned within a depth cueing area being set in the viewpoint coordinate system varying the α -value in spite of its shape or size. Nowhere does Foley disclose or suggest this feature.

None of the other references compensate for the deficiencies of Foley.

In summary, independent claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2, 5-6, 12, 15-16 and 22, 25-26 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/ldg

Date: October 13, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461